

**REMARKS**

Claims 3, 5-12, and 14-20 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 3, 7, 9, 12, 16 and 18 are amended and claims 1, 2, 4, and 13 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter therein. Support for the amendments to claims 3 and 12 may be found at least on page 2, line 29, to page 3, line 11. Support for the amendments to claims 7 and 16 may be found at least on page 3, lines 21 to 26. No new matter is added by the above amendment. In view of at least the following, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

**I. Claim Objections**

The Office Action objects to claims 3 and 9 for certain informalities. Claim 3 has been amended in accordance to the Examiner's suggestion with regards to "recipient mail server." Claim 3 has been further amended to provide sufficient support for the term "this unique hostname." Claim 9 has been amended in accordance to the Examiner's suggestions. Claim 12 has been similarly amended to overcome potential informalities. These objections are respectfully traversed.

**II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112**

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3 and 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards at the invention. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

By this Amendment, claims 1 and 2 are cancelled. Thus, the rejection as to claims 1 and 2 are moot.

Applicant respectfully submits that "hostname" is a clearly defined term. As defined by Wikipedia, hostname is "the unique name by which a network-attached device is known on a network." See <http://en.wikipedia.org/Hostname>. The hostname is used, for example, to "identify a particular host in various forms of electronic communication such as the World

Wide Web, e-mail or Usenet. *See id.* Thus, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-3 and 5-7 with regard to "hostname" is respectfully requested.

Claim 3 has been amended such that the second instance of the "domain name server" refers to the first. Claim 3 has further been amended to include "resolving the unique hostname," thus providing antecedent basis for claims 5-7.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

### **III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103**

The Office Action rejects claims 1-7, 11-16 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,986,049 (hereinafter "Delany"); and rejects claims 8-10 and 17-19 under U.S.C. §103(a) over Delany as applied to claims 3 and 12, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,219,131 (hereinafter "Banister"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

By this Amendment, claims 1-2, 4, and 13 are cancelled. Thus, the rejections as to claims 1-2, 4, and 13 are moot.

It is well settled that in determining the differences between the prior art and the claims, the question under 35 U.S.C. §103 is not whether the differences themselves would have been obvious, but whether the claimed invention as a whole would have been obvious. *See* MPEP § 2141.02. To this end, a prior art reference must be considered in its entirety, i.e., as a whole, including portions that would lead away from the claimed invention. *See* MPEP § 2141.02 VI.

Independent claim 3 recites, in part, "generating a unique identifier for the electronic message" and "storing a unique hostname based upon this unique identifier on a domain name server." Similarly, independent claim 12 recites, in part, "generating a unique identifier for the electronic message" and "storing a unique hostname based upon this unique identifier on a domain name server." In the presently claimed combination of features, each time an email is delivered, a new ID is created and added to the email. The ID is unique to that email, or more

specifically, email delivery. A unique hostname I then created and stored at the domain name server. When the emails is received at the recipient mail server, the unique ID is extracted and used to generate the unique hostname. The email is validated if the hostname can be resolved at the domain name server.

Contrarily, the method and system disclosed in Delany adds a Domain Key Selector to transmitted emails, such that the recipient mail server may use the Domain Key Selector as part of a hostname at which a pre-stored Public Key may be retrieved. The retrieved Public Key is then used together with a Private Key to validate the transmitted email.

Furthermore, the ID in Delany is not unique to each email or email delivery. Each domain Key Selector is used for multiple emails. Additionally, in Delany, a hostname is not created and stored at the Domain Name Server for each email or email delivery. In fact, the Public Key must be previously stored at an existing hostname at the Domain Name Server. Finally, Delany requires data processing at the recipient mail server in order to validate emails. In the presently claimed combination of features, however, no processing needs to be carried out. Further with respect to the presently claimed combination of features, if the hostname can be resolved at the domain name server, the email is validated.

Thus, Delany neither discloses nor renders obvious "generating a unique identifier for the electronic message" and "storing a unique hostname based upon this unique identifier on a domain name server." Delany further fails to disclose or render obvious "verifying authorization of the email message, wherein verifying authorization of the email message includes the extraction of the unique identifier from the email message at the recipient mail server and resolving the unique hostname based upon the unique identifier at the domain name server."

Claims 5-11, and 14-20 variously depend from claims 3 and 12. Because the applied references, in any combination, fail to render the subject matter of independent claims 3 and

12 obvious, dependent claims 5-11, and 14-20 are patentable for at least the reasons that claims 3 and 12 are patentable, as well as for the additional features they recite


Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

**IV. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

  
James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Linda M. Saltiel  
Registration No. 51,122

JAO:SQM/dqs

Attachment:

Petition for Extension of Time

Date: August 6, 2008

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 320850**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--